

PATENT

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated March 24, 2003. Claims 1 – 38 were rejected. Claims 1 – 38 have not been amended and remain pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1 – 14, 17 – 25, and 27 – 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,275,941 B1, granted to Saito, et al. (the Saito reference). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

The Saito reference does not disclose a relationship between “**credential types**” and “**trust-level**” requirements for information resources, and hence cannot disclose their use or exploitation as claimed. All of Applicant’s independent claims recite a correspondence or association between “**credential types**” and “**trust-levels**.**”** The Office Action apparently assumes that these features are described by the Saito reference, but they are **never** discussed in the Saito reference or any other art of record.

Since a correspondence between credential types and trust level requirements is not expressly shown in the Saito reference, Applicant must presume that the Office Action intends to rely on the doctrine of inherency. Applicant respectfully notes that “anticipation by inherent disclosure is appropriate only when the reference discloses prior art that must necessarily include the unstated limitation” (Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Serv. Inc., 290 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002), *citing* Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264, 1268-69 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). “To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence ‘must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill’” (In re Roberston, 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999), *quoting* Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). “Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient” (Id. at 1269, *quoting* In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 581 (C.C.P.A. 1981)). Applicant respectfully submits that none of these requirements for the Doctrine of Inherency are met with respect to Applicant’s claims and any of the art of record.

PATENT

The Saito reference describes a server for managing security information retrieving login information (user identifier and a password) with an integrated certificate that is input by a user, and providing the login credentials to the application server for determining access level of the user (Figures 5 – 6, col. 7 line 5 -- col. 8, line 63). If an integrated certificate is considered an *instance* of a first type of credential, and login credentials are an *instance* of a second type of credential, then the Saito reference describes using an *instance* of a first credential type for a specific user to retrieve an *instance* of a second credential type for the user, and determining an access level for that user with the *instance* of the second credential type. The Saito reference **never discloses or suggests a relationship between credential types and trust levels.**

Specifically, the Saito reference does not disclose or suggest “**a mapping rule establishing a correspondence between the sufficient trust-level and a set of suitable credential types**” as required by claim 1, “**an encoding of correspondence between trust-levels and credential types**” as required by claim 7, “**associating credential types with trust-levels**” as required by claims 24 and 36, and “**selecting from plural credential types, a credential type having an associated trust-level commensurate with the first trust-level requirement**” as required by claim 28.

The Office Action seems to assume that an integrated certificate of the Saito reference is “**credential types**” as required by Applicant’s independent claims. The integrated certificate described in the Saito reference is a specific digital certificate that corresponds to a particular user (Figures 3 and 5 – 8, col. 5, lines 32 – 55, col. 7, lines 25 – 30, col. 8, lines 6 – 25, col. 9, lines 16 – 22) and is **not** the same as “**credential types**.” An integrated certificate may be an instance of one type of credential, but it is **not** “**credential types**.” As a result, there is simply no correspondence between a credential type and a trust level.

The Office Action also assumes that “**access level**” as used in the Saito reference, is (are) the “**trust-level(s)**” recited by Applicant’s claims. Throughout the Saito reference, the term “**access level**” is used with reference to the level of access afforded to a particular user attempting to access a document (col. 6, lines 20 -22, col. 7, lines 44 – 56 and 63 – 67, and col. 9, lines 23 – 26). Unlike Saito’s access levels (which follow from a user’s login credentials),

PATENT

Applicants' "trust-levels" encode access requirements for information resources for which a given credential type (not a given user's login credentials) may be sufficient to establish appropriate authority.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's independent claims, and those that depend therefrom are allowable over the Saito reference and any other art of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 15 and 16 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Saito reference in view of U.S. Patent 5,610,981, granted to Mooney, et al. (the Mooney reference). The Office Action also rejects claim 26 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Saito reference in view of the publication WO 98/25373, listing an inventor Glogau (the Glogau reference). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

The dependent claims 15, 16, and 26 depend on corresponding ones of the above allowable independent claims, and therefore are also allowable. Moreover, Applicant notes that as with the Saito reference, the Office Action seems to misinterpret the disclosure contents of the Mooney reference and the Glogau reference. The Office Action seems to mistakenly interpret the user access privilege level disclosed in the Mooney reference as being similar to a trust level requirement, which it is not. Neither the Saito reference nor the Mooney reference, taken alone or in combination, renders claims 15 or 16 obvious.

With regard to the Glogau reference, the reference simply does not disclose what the Office Action suggests. In particular, there is no correspondence between credential types and trust levels and no obtaining of a first credential (with insufficient associated trust level), let alone an "addition credential" having an associated trust level commensurate with a requirement. Accordingly, neither the Saito reference nor the Glogau reference, taken alone or in combination, render claim 26 obvious.

Moreover, all of the dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 – 23, 25 – 27, 29 – 35, and 37 - 38 are dependent on one of the above allowable independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that all of the dependent claims are allowable.

PATENT

Conclusion

In summary, claims 1 - 38 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313.
 facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.



Steven R. Gilliam

6/23/2003

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 347-9030
(512) 347-9031 (fax)

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____